



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

IN VACATION.

He Got His Answer.—Attorney: I insist on an answer to my question. You have not told me all the conversation. I want to know everything that passed between you and Mr. Gibson on the occasion to which you refer.

Reluctant witness: I've told you everything of any consequence.

"You have told me what you said to him: 'Gibson, this case will get into the courts same day.' Now I want to know what he said in reply."

"Well, he said: 'Chumley, there isn't anything in this business that I'm ashamed of, and if any snoopin' little yee-hawin' four-by-six, gimlet-eyed lawyer, with half a pound of brains and sixteen pounds of jaw, ever wants to know what I've been talking to you about, you can tell him the whole story.'"

Jurisdiction of Earthly Courts.—In *Connor v. Skaggs*, 111 South-western Reporter 1132, wherein one daughter had been discriminated against by a parent because her marriage did not please him, the Missouri Supreme Court, speaking by Judge Lamm, finds from the evidence that there was no undue influence or lack of testamentary capacity, and therefore affirms the judgment of the lower court against the contestant, but adds this interesting bit of advice to the other heirs: "There is inferential evidence, as we see it, that the mother, when the hand of death rested heavily on her, left an injunction that the more fortunate children and grandchildren of Joseph Skaggs may find lasting happiness in remembering and obeying—an injunction meaning that they should see to it that the unbending rigor of their father's will should be tempered with equity and mercy. The enforcement of that tender and solemn injunction lies far beyond the jurisdiction and domain of earthly courts, but, peradventure, it is none the less a proper subject of judicial comment and judicial hope."